

### Remarks

The Office Action mailed June 2, 2005 has been carefully reviewed and the foregoing amendments have been made in consequence thereof.

Claims 1-47 are pending in this application. Claims 1-11 and 20-32 stand rejected. Claims 12-19 and 33-47 have been withdrawn from consideration.

In accordance with 37 C.F.R. 1.136(a), a two month extension of time is submitted herewith to extend the due date of the response to the Office Action dated June 2, 2005, for the above-identified patent application from September 2, 2005, through and including November 2, 2005. In accordance with 37 C.F.R. 1.17(a)(3), authorization to charge a deposit account in the amount of \$450.00 to cover this extension of time request also is submitted herewith.

The rejection of Claims 1-11 and 20-32 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Sragner (U.S. Patent No. 6,272,485) is respectfully traversed.

Applicants respectfully submit that Sragner does not describe or suggest the claimed invention. As discussed below, at least one of the differences between Sragner and the present invention is that Sragner does not describe or suggest a document assembly production system that includes a server having a plurality of templates and other document assembly assets including a plurality of input documents stored therein, wherein the server is configured to display on at least one remote computer a template selected by a user from the plurality of templates for prompting responses from the user relating to a transaction associated with the document assembly, and display document structure questions on the remote computer wherein the questions displayed are controlled by logic and conditions imbedded in the selected template and are displayed in a tree format.

Moreover, Sragner does not describe or suggest a document assembly production system that includes a server configured to receive a response for each question displayed, identify pre-assigned, modifiable input documents from a plurality of input documents compatible with the selected template for generating the documents to be assembled, and generate the assembled documents based on the identified input documents and the responses received.

Sragner describes a system and method for transmission of documents including word processing, spreadsheets, and other formatted documents, over a computer network with no need for additional formatting software. The Sragner system uses a Common Gateway Interface (CGI) sending script to send e-mail with the selected document, in its native format, as an attachment to e-mail submissions or obtained directly from websites using standard word processing programs, with end user prerequisites for using the method and system being standard word processing software and e-mail capability. The form may be returned to the server in electronic form, and the accompanying data posted to one or more databases, or automatically stored on disk, printed, or routed to other e-mail addresses.

More specifically, Sragner describes methods and systems that sends user-selected documents, which may also include related data, from a central server to a remote user automatically over a computer network utilizing a server gateway interface script to directly attach the selected document and any related data to an e-mail message directed to a designated e-mail address. The invention also provides for the return of documents and information from the user to the central server. The documents may be of any format, including forms, instructional materials, newsletters, and databases. The server gateway interface may be the Common Gateway Interface ("CGI"). The related data may include user-personal information, form-specific data, and user preferences.

Claim 1 recites a document assembly production system that includes a server having a plurality of templates and other document assembly assets including a plurality of input documents stored therein, and at least one remote computer configured to communicate with the server directing the server to access the plurality of templates and the other assembly assets to assemble fully formatted documents without using any document-assembly software and word processing software stored on the at least one remote computer, wherein the server is configured to "display on the at least one remote computer a template selected by the user from the plurality of templates for prompting responses from the user relating to a transaction associated with the document assembly...display document structure questions on the remote computer, wherein the questions displayed are controlled by logic and conditions imbedded in the selected template and are displayed in a tree format...receive a response for each question displayed...identify pre-

assigned, modifiable input documents from the plurality of input documents compatible with the selected template for generating the documents to be assembled...and generate the assembled documents based on the identified input documents and the responses received.”

Sragner does not describe or suggest a document assembly production system as recited in Claim 1. More specifically, Sragner does not describe or suggest a server having a plurality of templates and other document assembly assets including a plurality of input documents stored therein, and at least one remote computer configured to communicate with the server, wherein the server is configured to display on the at least one remote computer a template selected by the user from the plurality of templates for prompting responses from the user relating to a transaction associated with the document assembly, and *display document structure questions on the remote computer wherein the questions displayed are controlled by logic and conditions imbedded in the selected template and are displayed in a tree format.* (Emphasis added.)

Moreover, Sragner does not describe or suggest a document assembly production system that includes a server configured to receive a response for each question displayed, and *identify pre-assigned, modifiable input documents from the plurality of input documents compatible with the selected template for generating the documents to be assembled.* (Emphasis added.)

Furthermore, Sragner does not describe or suggest a document assembly production system that includes a server configured to *generate the assembled documents based on the identified input documents and the responses received.* (Emphasis added.)

Rather, Sragner describes methods and systems for transmission of documents including word processing, spreadsheets, and other formatted documents, over a computer network with no need for additional formatting software. The Sragner system uses a Common Gateway Interface (CGI) sending script to send e-mail with the selected document, in its native format, as an attachment to e-mail submissions or obtained directly from websites using standard word processing programs, with end user prerequisites for using the method and system being standard word processing software and e-mail capability.

Notably, Sragner does not describe, suggest or even mention a server configured to display document structure questions on a remote computer wherein the questions displayed are

controlled by logic and conditions imbedded in a selected template and are displayed in a tree format, identify pre-assigned, modifiable input documents from a plurality of input documents compatible with the selected template for generating the documents to be assembled, or generate the assembled documents based on the identified input documents and the responses received. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 1 is patentable over Sragner.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 1 is patentable over Sragner.

Claims 2-11 depend from independent Claim 1. When the recitations of Claims 2-11 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 1, Applicants submit that dependent Claims 2-11 likewise are patentable over Sragner.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 1-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) be withdrawn.

Claim 20 recites a document assembly production system that includes a server, a database coupled to the server for storing a plurality of templates and other document assembly assets including a plurality of input documents, and at least one remote computer in communication with the server, the server is in communication with a processor module, wherein the server is configured to “display on said at least one remote computer a template selected by a user from the plurality of templates for prompting responses from the user relating to a transaction associated with the document assembly...display document structure questions on said remote computer, wherein the questions displayed are controlled by logic and conditions imbedded in the selected template and are displayed in a tree format...receive a response for each question displayed...identify pre-assigned, modifiable input documents from the plurality of input documents compatible with the selected template for generating the documents to be assembled...and generate the assembled documents based on the identified input documents and the responses received.”

Claim 20 recites a document assembly production system that includes a server configured to perform steps essentially similar to those steps performed by the server recited in


Claim 1. Thus, it is submitted that Claim 20 is patentable over Sragner for at least the reasons that correspond to those given with respect to Claim 1.

Claims 21-32 depend from independent Claim 20. When the recitations of Claims 21-32 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 20, Applicants submit that dependent Claims 21-32 likewise are patentable over Sragner.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 1-11 and 20-32 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, all the Claims now active in the application are believed to be in condition for allowance. Favorable action is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,



---

Daniel M. Fitzgerald  
Registration No. 38,880  
ARMSTRONG TEASDALE LLP  
One Metropolitan Square, Suite 2600  
St. Louis, Missouri 63102-2740  
(314) 621-5070